

society as a whole, it would be better for him, it would be better for his family to not deny him or give someone the opportunity to deny him the right to hold down a job and become a productive member of society once again after he has served his sentence. I would urge the body to adopt this amendment.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: The Chair recognizes Senator Venditte.

SENATOR VENDITTE: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I rise to oppose Senator Reutzel's amendment. I think this is a very important part of the bill. I think that if you look at Section 2, the very first sentence there in Section 2, it says that, "if such a conviction is for a second offense". Now we're talking about second offense serious bodily injury. We're saying in a sense, that so, someone has permanently disfigured someone twice or in essence, even has killed someone twice, that this person should be allowed back on the streets to drive a motor vehicle. Personally, I feel that if a person has been caught twice, driving while under the influence of alcohol or any drug, and he has caused serious bodily injury, and I wish I had the definition according to statute as to what serious bodily injury is. I can tell you that it means permanent disfigurement. Now that to me is extremely serious and I don't think anyone in this body wants anyone driving a car who has done this to any human being for the second time. Again, I say that perhaps people such as this, should not be on the street at all at any time driving a car. I would hope that you would reject the Reutzel amendment and let's pass the bill on to E & R. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: The Chair recognizes Senator Simon.

SENATOR SIMON: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, I also arise to oppose the Reutzel amendment. It is kind of unusual that I oppose Senator Reutzel but this happens to be one of those issues. It seems to me that we are showing more concern in this instance for the man who is driving drunk and who has repeatedly had traffic incidents which either, as Senator Venditte said, either kill or dismember an individual and yet we have no concern or appear not to have very much concern for either those people who have had that happen to them or the few people in the future who may be injured by this person's driving. It seems to me that in view of the statistics which have been presented to the body, that more thought, more consideration should be given toward the protection of those individuals in the future rather than that one individual who has already demonstrated on numerous occasions they are irresponsible in their driving abilities.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: The Chair recognizes Senator Stoney.

SENATOR STONEY: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I also rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Senator Reutzel. You'll notice that this does not deal with the initial offense but a subsequent offense. You'll also note by reading the language that this provides the judge some latitude, the prerogative. It's permissive. It says the judge "may". It does not say "he shall", and I think the judges should be given that opportunity and for that reason I would not be supportive of Senator Reutzel's amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: Senator Reutzel, you may close on your amendment.